



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,992	01/25/2002	Laurent Frerebeau	T3264-907643	8715

181 7590 06/25/2007
MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 500
MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833

EXAMINER	
HILLERY, NATHAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/031,992	Applicant(s) FREREBEAU ET AL.	
	Examiner Nathan Hillery	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-17, 19 and 21-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-17, 19 and 21-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 4/2/07.
2. Claims 14 – 17, 19 and 21 – 33 are pending in the case. Claims 14, 23, 24, 27, and 28 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14 – 17, 19, 21 – 25 and 27 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christy et al. (US 20020002452 A1) and further in view of Helgeson et al. (US 6643652 B2).
5. **Regarding independent claim 14**, Christy et al. teach that text is represented at two levels: first in a language-specific, highly constrained grammar, and second in a language-neutral pivot language. Each level is desirably formatted in XML, using "tags" to characterize elements such as statements and field data. A tag surrounds the relevant element(s), beginning with a string of the form <tagname> and ending with </tagname>. For example, XML-represented content may include grammatical structures, identifiers for different meanings of the same word or word-concept, and other attributes (e.g., a set of expansion rules or allowed sentence structures) useful in performing translation (paragraph block 0058), which meet the limitation of **detecting a localization tag in the document, the localization tag controlling one or more of**

structure, appearance and dynamic behavior of the markup document; retrieving, from the document, localization information being associated with said localization tag, the localization information associated with a language.

Christy et al. teach that module 125 processes single linguistic units or structural components of each inputted sentence in an iterative fashion, addressing the databases 130 to locate the corresponding entries in the given language, as well as the corresponding entries in the target language (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **searching in a language translation file for a previously determined localized value associated with the localization information.**

Christy et al. teach that analysis module 125 translates the sentence by replacing the input entries with the entries from the target language, entering the translation into an output buffer 145. This process allows the remote user to create a Web page in which content is expressed in the pivot language, enabling the page to be provided in a requested language (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **replacing said localization tag in the document with the localized value found in the language translation file.**

Christy et al. do not explicitly teach **wherein said localization information includes an optional default localization value.**

Helgeson et al. teach that for an attribute, one can optionally specify whether it has a required attribute, its default value (Column 28, lines 9 – 11), which meet the limitation of **wherein said localization information includes an optional default localization value.**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Christy et al. with that of Helgeson et al. because such a combination would allow the users of Christy et al. the benefit of a method for managing data exchange among systems connected via a network (Column 2, lines 51 – 52).

6. **Regarding dependent claims 15 – 17 and 19**, Christy et al. teach that text is represented at two levels: first in a language-specific, highly constrained grammar, and second in a language-neutral pivot language. Each level is desirably formatted in XML, using "tags" to characterize elements such as statements and field data. A tag surrounds the relevant element(s), beginning with a string of the form <tagname> and ending with </tagname>. For example, XML-represented content may include grammatical structures, identifiers for different meanings of the same word or word-concept, and other attributes (e.g., a set of expansion rules or allowed sentence structures) useful in performing translation (paragraph block 0058), which meet the limitation of **said localization information includes at least one of a localization attribute, a default localization value, and a value corresponding to an automatic transcription function; identifying a type of the document; detecting said localization tag based on the type of document identified in said identifying step; and recognizing at least one of grammar and syntax used in the document based on the type of document identified in said identifying step; said tag is a markup language tag.**

7. **Regarding dependent claim 21**, Christy et al. teach that text is represented at two levels: first in a language-specific, highly constrained grammar, and second in a language-neutral pivot language. Each level is desirably formatted in XML, using "tags" to characterize elements such as statements and field data. A tag surrounds the relevant element(s), beginning with a string of the form <tagname> and ending with </tagname>. For example, XML-represented content may include grammatical structures, identifiers for different meanings of the same word or word-concept, and other attributes (e.g., a set of expansion rules or allowed sentence structures) useful in performing translation (paragraph block 0058), which meet the limitation of **creating the language translation file to include information which associates said localization information with said localized value.**

8. **Regarding dependent claim 22**, Christy et al. teach that module 125 processes single linguistic units or structural components of each inputted sentence in an iterative fashion, addressing the databases 130 to locate the corresponding entries in the given language, as well as the corresponding entries in the target language. Analysis module 125 translates the sentence by replacing the input entries with the entries from the target language, entering the translation into an output buffer 145. This process allows the remote user to create a Web page in which content is expressed in the pivot language, enabling the page to be provided in a requested language (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **loading code used to implement said localization tool into the document, said code dynamically generating additional code; and**

Art Unit: 2176

performing said replacing step as said additional code is dynamically generated by said code used to implement said localization tool.

9. **Regarding dependent claims 29 – 33**, Christy et al. teach that Maintaining the entire document in the pivot language facilitates not only accurate searching but also ready translation into different languages (paragraph block 0055), which meet the limitation of **said language translation file is maintained using a pivot language.**

10. **Regarding independent claims 23, 24, 27, and 28**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 14, and are rejected along the same rationale.

11. **Regarding dependent claim 25**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 22, and is rejected along the same rationale.

12. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christy et al. (US 20020002452 A1) and Helgeson et al. (US 6643652 B2) as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Jeske (US005974443A) [as cited by Applicant].

13. **Regarding dependent claim 26**, Christy et al. does not explicitly teach the **localization tool is a CGI component.**

However, Jeske teaches that *the preferred embodiment is to use CGI 111, which is an industry standard method of communicating between a web server and another program. HTTPd 103 initiates the CGIG process (common gateway interface gateway)*

Art Unit: 2176

104, which is a program component that provides access to the agent platform 105.

Note that more than one CGIG 104 can be running on the web server 102, with one CGIG per concurrent browser request (Column 3, lines 15 – 22), which meet the limitation of the localization tool is a CGI component.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Christy et al. and Helgeson et al. with that of Jeske because such a combination would allow the users of Christy et al. and Helgeson et al. the benefit of an *access tool that allows for dynamic information generation for web servers* (Column 2, lines 54 – 55).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14 – 17, 19, and 21 – 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2176

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NH


Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100